arXiv:1608.01635v2 [math.MG] 28 Oct 2016

UNRECTIFIABLE NORMAL CURRENTS IN EUCLIDEAN SPACES

ANDREA SCHIOPPA

Abstract. We construct in $\mathbb{R}^{k+2}$ a k-dimensional simple normal current whose support is purely 2-unrectifiable. The result is sharp because the support of a normal current cannot be purely 1-unrectifiable and a $(k+1)$-dimensional normal current can be represented as an integral of $(k+1)$-rectifiable currents. This gives a negative answer to the (revised version) of a question of Frank Morgan (1984).

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. 2-current in Hilbert space 4
3. 2-current in $\mathbb{R}^4$ 11
4. k-current in $\mathbb{R}^{k+2}$ 21
References 26

1. Introduction

1.1. **Results.** This paper is a continuation of [Sch15] to which we refer for more background and notation. The main motivation behind [Sch15] was to provide new examples of Ambrosio-Kirchheim metric currents [AK00a] and to prove that higher-dimensional analogues of some results in [Sch16a, Sch14] *do not* hold. Specifically, in [Sch16a] it was shown that in metric measure spaces vector fields can be concretely described as a superposition of partial derivative operators associated with curve fragments. In particular, the background measure μ appearing in the definition of vector fields (see for example Subsec. 2.1 in [Sch15] about Weaver derivations) has to admit Alberti representations or, more precisely, has to be **1-rectifiably representable**; this means that μ can be represented as an integral of 1-dimensional Hausdorff measures associated with curve fragments γ: $\mu = \int \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \gamma dQ(\gamma)$. In the case in which a higher order representation exists, i.e. $\mu = \int \mathcal{H}^k \llcorner \sigma dQ(\sigma)$ where σ is a k-rectifiable compact set (see [AK00b] for the theory of rectifiable sets in metric spaces) we will say that μ is **k-rectifiably representable**.

In [Sch14] it was later shown that 1-dimensional metric currents admitted an integral representation in terms of 1-rectifiable metric currents $T = \int [[\gamma]]\, dQ(\gamma)$ ($[[\gamma]]$ being the current associated to an oriented fragment) and that k-dimensional metric currents could be canonically associated to k-dimensional vector fields obtaining

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 49Q15, 28A75.
Key words and phrases. Normal current, Rectifiability.

a parallel between the metric theory of Ambrosio-Kirchheim [AK00a] and the classical theory of Federer and Fleming [Fed69, Ch. 4]. A natural question we had at the time was whether a 2-dimensional metric current T could be represented as an integral of 2-rectifiable currents $T = \int [[\sigma]]\, dQ(\sigma)$. Some specific examples of *non-simple* (i.e. the associated vector fields are not simple) 2-dimensional currents with 2-purely unrectifiable supports had been obtained by Marshall Williams [Wil12] in Carnot groups. In [Sch15] we obtained a general negative answer constructing for each k a simple k-dimensional normal metric current whose support is purely 2-unrectifiable. Unfortunately, those currents could not be constructed in Euclidean spaces. In this paper we complete the treatment by:

Construction 1.1. In $\mathbb{R}^{k+2}$ there is a k-dimensional normal current whose support is purely 2-unrectifiable.

Note that our normal currents are also classical normal currents, thus providing examples of normal currents which live on 2-unrectifiable subsets.

1.2. **Relation to previous work.** Even though I came across this problem while finishing my dissertation in 2014, I later found that other researchers had previously considered it. I learned from Giovanni Alberti that he had considered also this problem, and later found out the following question of Frank Morgan [mor86, Problem 3.8, pg. 446]:

> **(Q-Morgan):** Question of Frank Morgan. "Can every normal current in $\mathbb{R}^s$ be decomposed as a convex integral combination of integral currents? In codimension one the answer is *yes* if $\partial T = 0$, see [Fed69, # 4.5.9(13)]". (In my own words): Is a k-dimensional normal current T in $\mathbb{R}^s$ representable as an integral $\int [[\sigma]]\, dQ(\sigma)$ of k-integral currents enforcing the **mass constraint** (here is what "convex" probably means) $\|T\| = \int \|[[\sigma]]\|\, dQ(\sigma)$? Here $\|T\|$ denotes the mass measure of T.

The answer to **(Q-Morgan)** for $k = 1$ is positive by the beautiful work of Stanislav Smirnov [Smi93], and recently we have learned from Alberti and Massacesi that this is also the case for $k = s - 1$ as a consequence of the coarea formula for BV functions [Mas14, AFP00]: essentially they find a "good filling" for the boundary of the normal current to reduce the problem to the case $\partial T = 0$ sketched by Morgan.

In general the answer to **(Q-Morgan)** is negative: Zworski [Zwo88] gives as counterexample $T = \xi\, \mathcal{H}^s$ where ξ is a suitable non-involutive k-field (a small gap in his argument is pointed out and fixed in [Mas14, Chap. 2]). However, these examples are still representable as integrals of integral currents if one drops the mass constraint, and if one wants to keep the mass constraint, one can use a remarkable Theorem of Alberti [Alb91] to obtain an integral decomposition into rectifiable currents by finding rectifiable sets tangent to the non-involutive distribution. This suggests the following revised version of **(Q-Morgan)**:

> **(Q-MorganRev):** Is a k-dimensional normal current T in $\mathbb{R}^s$ representable as an integral $\int [[\sigma]]\, dQ(\sigma)$ of *k-rectifiable currents without* necessarily satisfying the mass constraint?

Our result answers **(Q-MorganRev)** in the negative for all $k \leq s-2$: the support of a k-current does not need even to intersect a 2-rectifiable set in positive area.

Our work has also applications to the recent structure theory for measures developed in [ACP10]. In particular, this answers the problem of whether measures that admit a k-tangent field (this essentially gives the directions along which

a Rademacher Theorem on the differentiability of Lipschitz functions holds) in the sense of [ACP10] are k-rectifiably representable. Following [Sch14, DR16] we rephrase the problem in the language of normal currents:

> **(Q-ACP):** Question of Alberti, Csörnyei and Preiss [ACP10, Sec. 2]. If μ is a Radon measure on $\mathbb{R}^s$ and for $1 < k \leq s$ there are k 1-dimensional normal currents $\{N_i\}_{i=1}^k$ with $\mu \ll \|N_i\|$ and such that at μ-a.e. point the vector fields associated to the N_i are independent, is then μ k-rectifiably representable?

For $k = s$ **(Q-ACP)** has a positive answer by the recent work of de Philippis and Rindler [DR16]. For $s = 3$ and $k = 2$ a negative result has been been announced by Andras Mathe [Mát]. Our construction answers **(Q-ACP)** in the negative for all $k \in \{2, \cdots, s-2\}$. It is likely that modifications to our approach can also yield the negative answer for $k = s - 1$, but we do not pursue it further because it is likely to follow also from the announced results of [Mát].

1.3. **Organization.** In the paper we follow the same approach in which we discovered the result: there are the following 3-layers:

> **Layer 1:** A 2-normal current in the Hilbert space l^2 whose support is purely 2-unrectifiable.
> **Layer 2:** A 2-normal current in $\mathbb{R}^4$ whose support is purely 2-unrectifiable.
> **Layer 3:** A k-normal current in $\mathbb{R}^{k+2}$ whose support is purely 2-unrectifiable.

Layer 1 (Sec. 2) is already non-trivial because the Hilbert space has the Radon-Nikodym property, i.e. Lipschitz Hilbert-valued functions are differentiable a.e. It is not hard to show that this implies that the examples in [Sch15] cannot be bi-Lipschitz embedded in Hilbert space. However, we are able to find a topological embedding of those examples which is Lipschitz; an examination of the construction allows to find a "rate of collapse" of the fibers of the double covers used in [Sch15] which allows to prove 2-unrectifiability. Unfortunately, the Radon-Nikodym property prevents the use of a simple blow-up argument as in [Sch15] and we must resort to a quantitative estimate based on holonomy.

In **Layer 2** (Sec 3) we pass from Hilbert space to $\mathbb{R}^4$ by resorting to kernel methods (see for example [MRT12, Ch. 5], [GBV93]) which are well-known in the SVMs literature. Essentially the kernel trick allows to train an SVM on an ∞-dimensional *implicit* set of features even though the data set has (obviously) only features living in a finite dimensional space. For example, in $\mathbb{R}^4$ we can fabricate something like the Hilbert space l^2 (countable sequences) using kernel functions. Unfortunately, this approach destroys the approximate "self-similarity" of the construction in Hilbert space making the details more technical and lengthy. In particular, we must resort to curvilinear $(1+\varepsilon)$-Lipschitz projections to resolve the fine structure of the support of the current at a given scale.

In **Layer 3** (Sec 4) we obtain the general case using a simple idea from [Sch15] (I am indebted to Bruce Kleiner for it) which consists in destroying Lipschitz surfaces which are graphs on any pair of coordinate axes.

1.4. **Notational conventions.** For notational conventions, background and terminology we refer the reader to [Sch15, Sec. 2]. Here we use a more general notion of weak* convergence for Lipschitz functions.

Definition 1.2 (Weak* convergence for Lipschitz maps)**.** Let $\{f_n\}_n$ be a sequence of Lipschitz maps $f_n : X \to Y$. We say that f_n converges to a Lipschitz map $f : X \to Y$ in the **weak* sense** (and write $f_n \xrightarrow{\text{w}^*} f$) if $f_n \to f$ pointwise and $\sup_n \mathbf{L}(f_n) < \infty$, where $\mathbf{L}(f_n)$ denotes the Lipschitz constant of f_n.

Assume that the sets $X_n \subset Z$ converge to the set $X \subset Z$ in the Hausdorff sense. For $x \in X$ we say that $\{x_n\}_n \subset Z$ with $x_n \in X_n$ **represents** $x \in X$ if $x_n \to x$. Let $\{f_n\}_n$ be a sequence of Lipschitz maps $f_n : X_n \to Y$. We say that f_n converges to a Lipschitz map $f : X \to Y$ in the **weak* sense** (and write $f_n \xrightarrow{\text{w}^*} f$) if $\sup_n \mathbf{L}(f_n) < \infty$, and whenever $\{x_n\}_n$ represents x, $f_n(x_n) \to f(x)$.

Note that in the previous definition one may check, for each x, that $f_n(x_n) \to f(x)$ just for one sequence $\{x_n\}_n$ representing x, thanks to the uniform bound on the Lipschitz constants of the functions f_n.

Now assume also that the sets $Y_n \subset W$ converge to the set $Y \subset W$ in the Hausdorff sense. We say that a squence $f_n : X_n \to Y_n$ converges to a Lipschitz map $f : X \to Y$ in the **weak* sense** (and write $f_n \xrightarrow{\text{w}^*} f$) if $\sup_n \mathbf{L}(f_n) < \infty$, and whenever $\{x_n\}_n$ represents x, $f_n(x_n)$ represents $f(x)$.

In this paper there are only a couple of points where we use measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence. For background and notational conventions we refer to [Sch16b, Subsec. 3.1]. However, here we always reduce to the classical case by assuming that convergence takes place in a **container** Z: if (X_n, μ_n) converges to (X, μ) in the measured Gromov-Hausdorff sense, we assume that X_n and X are isometrically embedded in Z, and then that $X_n \to X$ in the Hausdorff sense and $\mu_n \to \mu$ in the weak* sense for Radon measures (i.e. as functionals on continuous functions defined on Z which are bounded and have bounded support).

Finally, we use the convention $a \simeq b$ (or $a \approx b$) to say that $a/b, b/a \in [C^{-1}, C]$ where C is a universal constant; when we want to highlight C we write $a \simeq_C b$. We similarly use notations like $a \lesssim b$ and $a \gtrsim_C b$.

Acknowledgements. This work has been partially supported by by the "ETH Zurich Postdoctoral Fellowship Program and the Marie Curie Actions for People COFUND Program".

2. 2-current in Hilbert space

Let $\{X_i\}_i$ denote the inverse system of square complexes in [Sch15, Sec. 4], denote by X_∞ the corresponding inverse limit, and for $m \leq n$ ($n = \infty$ being allowed) let $\pi_{n,m} : X_n \to X_m$ denote the corresponding 1-Lipschitz projection. We let $\delta_n \searrow 0$ denote a sequence with $\sum_n \delta_n = \infty$ and $\sum_n \delta_n^2 < \infty$: the precise form of δ_n will be determined later.

We briefly recall how X_{i+1} is obtained out of X_i. Let $\mathrm{Sq}_i(X_i)$ denote the set of squares of generation i of X_i, whose side length is $l_i = 5^{-i}$. To get X_{i+1} one subdivides each square $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_i(X_i)$ and applies the following operation. The square Q is subdivided into squares of generation $i+1$; there are 5^2 such squares that, up to idenfying Q with $[0,5]^2$, can be indexed by the location of their south-west corner by pairs $(j_1, j_2) \in \{0, \cdots, 4\}^2$. These squares are grouped into three pieces:

- The central square Q_c corresponding to $(j_1, j_2) = (2, 2)$.
- The outer annulus Q_o corresponding to the squares where either $j_1 \in \{0, 4\}$ or $j_2 \in \{0, 4\}$.

- The middle annulus $Q_{\rm a}$ consisting of the squares neither in $Q_{\rm c}$ nor in $Q_{\rm o}$.

We make the simple observation $\mathcal{H}^2(Q_{\rm a}) \geq \frac{8}{25}\mathcal{H}^2(Q)$ and replace $Q_{\rm a}$ by a double cover $\tilde{Q}_{\rm a}$, split the Lebesgue measure on $Q_{\rm a}$ in half and glue $\tilde{Q}_{\rm a}$ back to $Q_{\rm c}$ and $Q_{\rm o}$ by collapsing the fibers of the cover on the boundary $\partial\tilde{Q}_{\rm a}$ to match $\partial Q_{\rm c}$ and the inner component of $\partial Q_{\rm o}$. Let $\tilde{Q}$ denote the square-complex thus obtained.

Construction 2.1 (A map $\Psi : \tilde{Q} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ depending on a parameter δ)**.** Fix $\delta > 0$ small. Let $\hat{Q}_{\rm a} \subset Q_{\rm a}$ be the central annulus of the first subdivision of $Q_{\rm a}$ consisting of those squares in $\mathrm{Sq}_{i+2}(Q_{\rm a})$ which are at distance $\geq 5^{-i-2}$ from $\partial Q_{\rm a}$. We observe that: $\mathcal{H}^2(\hat{Q}_{\rm a}) \geq \frac{3}{5}\mathcal{H}^2(Q_{\rm a})$.

Choose a 1-cell σ in the 1-skeleton of $\mathrm{Sq}_{i+1}(Q_{\rm a})$ which joins the two components of $\partial Q_{\rm a}$. Note that σ can be used to choose an "origin" of the angles for a polar coordinate system (r,θ) on $Q_{\rm a}$. Formally, we identify $Q_{\rm a} \simeq [0, 5^{-i-1}] \times S^1$ and on $Q_{\rm a} \setminus \sigma$ we have polar coordinates $(r,\theta) : Q_{\rm a} \setminus \sigma \to [0, 5^{-i-1}] \times (0, 2\pi)$. Moreover, the set $\hat{Q}_{\rm a} \setminus \sigma$ is determined by the condition $r \in [5^{-i-2}, 5^{-i-1} - 5^{-i-2}]$.

Let $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{Q} \to Q$ denote the double cover and note that on $\Sigma = \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(Q_{\rm a} \setminus \sigma)$ we get a polar coordinate system $(r,\theta) : \Sigma \to [0, 5^{-i-1}] \times [(0, 4\pi) \setminus \{2\pi\}]$, and that the map $\tilde{\pi}$, in polar coordinates, assumes the form $\tilde{\pi}(r,\theta) = (r, \theta \mod 2\pi)$. In particular, $\tilde{\pi}^{-1}(\sigma)$ divides Σ in two sheets: Σ_+ where $\theta \in (2\pi, 4\pi)$, and Σ_- where $\theta \in (0, 2\pi)$. We let χ denote the characteristic function of Σ_+; the following observation is crucial in the following:

(ShSep): If $p, q \in \Sigma$, $d_{\tilde{Q}}(p,q) \leq 5^{-i-3}$ and $\tilde{\pi}(p)$ and $\tilde{\pi}(q)$ are on opposite sides of σ (i.e $|\theta(\tilde{\pi}(p)) - \theta(\tilde{\pi}(q))| \geq \pi$), then $\chi(p) \neq \chi(q)$.

We now define two helper functions $h_1, h_2 : [0, 4\pi] \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$h_1(\theta) = \frac{\delta}{2\pi}\left(2\pi - |\theta - 2\pi|\right), \tag{2.2}$$

$$h_2(\theta) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\delta}{\pi}\theta & \text{if } \theta \in [0, \pi], \\ -\delta + \frac{\delta}{\pi}(\theta - \pi) & \text{if } \theta \in [\pi, 3\pi], \\ \delta - \frac{\delta}{\pi}(\theta - 3\pi) & \text{if } \theta \in [3\pi, 4\pi]. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

Note that the global Lipschtiz constants of h_1 and h_2 are: $\mathbf{L}(h_1) = \delta/(2\pi)$ and $\mathbf{L}(h_2) = \delta/\pi$. One also has the lower bound:

$$\inf_{\theta \in [0, 2\pi]} \left[(h_1(\theta) - h_1(\theta + 2\pi))^2 + (h_2(\theta) - h_2(\theta + 2\pi))^2\right]^{1/2} \geq \frac{\delta}{2}, \tag{2.4}$$

which is proven in three cases; case $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$: then $h_1(\theta) \leq \delta/4$ and $h_1(\theta + 2\pi) \geq 3\delta/4$; case $\theta \in [\pi/2, 3\pi/2]$: then $h_2(\theta) \in [-\delta, -\delta/2]$ and $h_2(\theta + \pi) \in [\delta/2, \delta]$; case $\theta \in [3\pi/2, 2\pi]$: then $h_1(\theta) \geq 3\delta/4$ and $h_1(\theta + 2\pi) \leq \delta/4$.

We now define the 5-Lipschitz cut-off function $\phi : [0, 5^{-i-1}] \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$\phi(r) = \begin{cases} 5r & \text{if } r \in [0, 5^{-i-2}], \\ 5^{-i-1} & \text{if } r \in [5^{-i-2}, 5^{-i-1} - 5^{-i-2}], \\ 5^{-i-1}[1 - 5^{i+2}(r - 5^{-i-1} + 5^{-i-2})] & \text{if } r \in [5^{-i-1} - 5^{-i-2}, 5^{-i-1}], \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

and note that $\|\phi\|_\infty \leq 5^{-i-1}$.

We now define Ψ using polar coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi : \Sigma &\to \mathbb{R}^2 \\ (r,\theta) &\mapsto (\phi(r)h_1(\theta), \phi(r)h_2(\theta)), \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

and find the unique continuous extension $\Psi : \tilde{Q} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\Psi = 0$ on $Q_{\mathrm{c}} \cup Q_{\mathrm{o}}$. We now collect the important properties of Ψ. First, if $p_1, p_2 \in \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(q)$ for $q \in Q_{\mathrm{a}} \setminus \sigma$ and $|\theta(p_1) - \theta(p_2)| = \pi$, then (2.4) implies:

$$\|\Psi(p_1) - \Psi(p_2)\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\phi(r(p_1)). \tag{2.7}$$

Second from the upper bound on ϕ we get:

$$\|\Psi\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \leq \delta \operatorname{diam} Q, \tag{2.8}$$

and third, from computing $d\Psi$ and using the standard Riemannian metric $r^2 d\theta^2 + dr^2$ on Σ, we estimate the global Lipschitz constant of Ψ:

$$\mathbf{L}(\Psi) \in [\delta, 7\delta]. \tag{2.9}$$

In the following we let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ denote the standard orthonormal basis of l^2.

Construction 2.10 (Construction of maps $F_i : X_i \to l^2$)**.** The map $F_0 : X_0 \to l^2$ is just an isometric embedding of the square X_0 in the plane $e_1 \oplus e_2$. To get $F_1 : X_1 \to l^2$ we modify $F_0 \circ \pi_{1,0}$ by adding to it $\Psi_{\delta_1} \otimes (e_3 \oplus e_4)$: this notation means that we take the map Ψ from Construction 2.1 with $\delta = \delta_1$ and with $\tilde{Q}$ the unique square $\{Q\} = \mathrm{Sq}_0(X_0)$, and then we identify the codomain of Ψ with the plane $e_3 \oplus e_4$. In particular note that:

$$\|F_0 \circ \pi_{1,0} - F_1\|_\infty \lesssim \delta_1 5^{-1} \tag{2.11}$$

$$\mathbf{L}(F_1) \lesssim (1 + \delta_1^2)^{1/2}. \tag{2.12}$$

For $i \geq 1$, the map F_{i+1} is defined by induction. We first have that $\operatorname{Im} F_i$ is a subset of the hyperplane of l^2 spanned by the vectors $\{e_\alpha\}_{1 \leq \alpha \leq 2i+2}$; then for each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_i(X_i)$ we choose $\Psi_{\delta_i, Q} : \tilde{Q} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as in Construction 2.1 setting $\delta = \delta_{i+1}$, and we then let:

$$F_{i+1} = F_i \circ \pi_{i+1,i} + \sum_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_i(X_i)} \Psi_{\delta_i, Q} \otimes (e_{2i+3} \oplus e_{2i+4}). \tag{2.13}$$

As we have inserted the new contributions in a plane orthogonal to $\operatorname{Im} F_i$ we conclude that:

$$\mathbf{L}(F_{i+1}) \lesssim (1 + \delta_1^2 + \cdots + \delta_i^2)^{1/2}, \tag{2.14}$$

and moreover:

$$\|F_i \circ \pi_{i+1,i} - F_{i+1}\|_\infty \lesssim \delta_i 5^{-i-1}. \tag{2.15}$$

Lemma 2.16 (Convergence of the maps $F_i \circ \pi_{\infty,i}$)**.** *The pull-backs $F_i \circ \pi_{\infty,i}$ converge uniformly to a map $F_\infty : X_\infty \to l^2$ whose Lipschitz constant satisfies:*

$$\mathbf{L}(F_\infty) \lesssim \left(1 + \sum_i \delta_i^2\right)^{1/2}. \tag{2.17}$$

Let $P_i : l^2 \to l^2$ denote the orthogonal projection of l^2 onto the hyperplane spanned by $\{e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_{2i+1}, e_{2i+2}\}$ and let $i \leq j$ where $j = \infty$ is admissible. Defining $Y_j = F_j(X_j)$ we have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_j & \xrightarrow{F_j} & Y_j \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{j,i}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_i} \\ X_i & \xrightarrow[F_i]{} & Y_i \end{array} \tag{2.18}$$

Proof. By (2.15) the $F_i \circ \pi_{i+1,i}$ converge uniformly and the limit map F_∞ satisfies the Lipschitz bound (2.17) as (2.14) implies a uniform bound on the Lipschitz constants of the $\{F_i\}_i$. When $j < \infty$ the commutativity of the diagram (2.18) follows from the definition of the maps $\{F_i\}_i$; for $j = \infty$ one passes the commutativity to the limit. □

In the following we let N_∞ be the 2-normal current canonically associated to X_∞: details and the precise definition of N_∞ are in [Sch15, Sec. 3]. Recall also that, even though N_∞ is a *metric current*, the calculus on X_∞ is similar to the classical one in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and N_∞ admits a "classical" 2-vector-field representation: $N_\infty = \partial_x \wedge \partial_y \, d\mu_{X_\infty}$.

Lemma 2.19 (Existence and nontriviality of the 2-current)**.** *The push-forward $F_{\infty\#}N_\infty$ is a nontrivial 2-normal current in l^2 supported on Y_∞.*

Proof. As F_∞ is Lipschitz (actually it is a Lipschitz embedding, but *not* biLipschitz as the biLipschitz constants of the F_i degrade as $i \nearrow \infty$), we only have to show that $F_{\infty\#}N_\infty$ is nontrivial. Let x, y denote the standard "coordinate" functions on $e_1 \oplus e_2$, and assume that Y_0 is normalized to be a unit square in that plane. Using the commutativity of the diagram (2.18) for $j = \infty$ and $i = 0$ we get:

$$P_{0\#}F_{\infty\#}N_\infty(dx \wedge dy) = (F_0 \circ \pi_{\infty,0})_\# N_\infty(dx \wedge dy) = F_{0\#}N_0(dx \wedge dy) = 1, \tag{2.20}$$

where N_0 denotes the current associated to X_0, i.e. the anticlockwise-oriented unit square with the Lebesgue measure. □

Theorem 2.21 (2-unrectifiability of Y_∞)**.** *Y_∞ is purely 2-unrectifiable in the sense that whenever $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is compact and $\Phi : K \to l^2$ is Lipschitz, $\mathcal{H}^2(\Phi^{-1}(Y_\infty) \cap K) = 0$.*

Proof. We will argue by contradiction assuming that $K \subset \Phi^{-1}(Y_\infty)$ and that $\mathcal{H}^2(K) > 0$.

`Step 1: Reduction to the case in which Φ is a graph over` Y_0.

Let $\Phi_n = P_n \circ \Phi$ and, using the Radon-Nikodym property of l^2, note that at each point $p \in K$ of differentiability of Φ one has that each Φ_n is also differentiable at p and that:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d\Phi_n(p) = d\Phi(p), \tag{2.22}$$

where the limit is in the norm-topology of linear maps $\mathbb{R}^2 \to l^2$. Following the notation of [AK00b, Sec. 4&5], we let J_2 denote the Jacobian appearing in the area formula; by dominated convergence we then have:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_K \chi_E J_2(d\Phi_n) \, d\mathcal{H}^2 = \int_K \chi_E J_2(d\Phi) \, d\mathcal{H}^2 \tag{2.23}$$

whenever $E \subset K$ is a Borel set.

We now consider the Borel set $E \subset K$ consisting of those points which are Lebesgue density points of the set of points where Φ is differentiable and where $d\Phi_0$ has rank < 2, and our goal is to show that:

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\operatorname{Im}\Phi \cap P_0^{-1}(\Phi_0(E))) = 0. \tag{2.24}$$

Note that the area formula [AK00b, Thm. 5.1] gives $\mathcal{H}^2(\Phi_0(E) \cap Y_0) = 0$. For each $n \geq 1$, using the square complex structure of $\{X_i\}_{i \leq n}$, the set Y_n can be partitioned into finitely many closed sets $\{S_\alpha\}_\alpha$ such that each restriction $P_0|_{S_\alpha} : S_\alpha \to P_0(S_\alpha)$ is biLipschitz, thus giving:

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\Phi_n(E) \cap Y_n) = 0. \tag{2.25}$$

In particular, the area formula implies that:

$$\int_K \chi_E J_2(d\Phi_n)\, d\mathcal{H}^2 = 0. \tag{2.26}$$

Therefore, by (2.24) we conclude that:

$$\int_K \chi_E J_2(d\Phi)\, d\mathcal{H}^2 = 0 \tag{2.27}$$

and then (2.24) follows from the area formula.

Therefore by (2.24) we can assume that $d\Phi_0$ has full rank 2 on the set of Lebesgue density points of the set of differentiability points of Φ. Using [Kir94, Thm. 9], which is essentially a Lipschitz version of the Inverse Function Theorem, up to further partitioning K and throwing away a set of null measure, we can assume that Φ is C-biLipschitz and that $\Phi_0 \circ \Phi = \mathrm{Id}_{\Phi_0(K)}$. In particular, we can assume that $K \subset Y_0$ and that Φ_0 is just the identity map.

`Step 2: Existence of square holes at scale` 5^{-n}.

Note that the square-complex structure of X_n induces a square-complex structure on Y_n via the homeomorphism F_n; in the following for $i \geq n$ we will implicitly identify $\mathrm{Sq}_i(Y_n)$ with $\mathrm{Sq}_i(X_n)$.

Fix now n and a square $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{n-1}(Y_0)$. Let $\hat{Q}_{\mathrm{a}}$ and σ be as in Construction 2.1 and recall that $\hat{Q}_{\mathrm{a}}$ consists of squares of $\mathrm{Sq}_{n+2}(Y_0)$.

We now fix a small parameter c to be determined later in function of the bi-Lipschitz constant C of Φ and the Lipschitz constant of F_∞. Let

$$i_n = \lceil -\log_5(5^{-n-2} c \delta_n) \rceil \tag{2.28}$$

and partition $\hat{Q}_{\mathrm{a}}$ into $\approx 5^{i_n - n}$ annuli consisting of squares of $\mathrm{Sq}_{i_n}(Y_0)$. We consider one such an annulus A. Our goal is to show that K has to miss the interior of one of the squares in A.

We first order the squares $\{R_\alpha\}_{1 \leq \alpha \leq t}$ of A anticlockwise so that $R_{\alpha+1}$ follows R_α, and R_1 follows R_t, and R_1 and R_t meet along a subsegment of σ. Assume that K intersects each $\mathrm{Int}(R_\alpha)$ and let $p_\alpha \in K \cap \mathrm{Int}(R_\alpha)$.

We first show that for $0 \leq j \leq n$ the points $\Phi_j(p_\alpha)$ and $\Phi_j(p_{(\alpha+1) \mod t})$ belong to the same square of $\mathrm{Sq}_j(Y_j)$. In the following we use β to denote α or $(\alpha+1)$ mod t and we will just write $\alpha + 1$ for $(\alpha + 1) \mod t$.

For $j = 0$ by construction $\Phi_0(p_\alpha)$ and $\Phi_0(p_{\alpha+1})$ belong to the same square of $\mathrm{Sq}_0(Y_0)$, and for $j \geq 1$ we assume by induction that $\Phi_{j-1}(p_\alpha)$, $\Phi_{j-1}(p_{\alpha+1})$ belong to the same $Q_{j-1}^{(j-1)} \in \mathrm{Sq}_{j-1}(Y_{j-1})$. Let $Q_{j,\beta}^{(j)} \in \mathrm{Sq}_j(Y_j)$ denote the square containing

$\Phi_j(p_\beta)$ and assume by contradiction that $Q^{(j)}_{j,\alpha} \neq Q^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1}$. In the following we will use the decorators $_{\mathrm{a}}$, $_{\mathrm{o}}$, $_{\mathrm{c}}$ and $\hat{}$ as in Construction 2.1: for example $\hat{Q}^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}$ is obtained as $\hat{Q}_{\mathrm{a}}$ if we let $Q = Q^{(j-1)}_{j-1}$. In particular, as $Q^{(j)}_{j,\alpha} \neq Q^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1}$ we must have $P_{j-1}(Q^{(j)}_{j,\beta}) \subset Q^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}$. Let now $Q^{(0)}_{i_n,\beta} \in \mathrm{Sq}_{i_n}(Q^{(0)}_{n-1})$ denote the square containing p_β, let $q^{(0)}_\beta$ be its center, set $Q^{(j)}_{i_n,\beta} = P_0^{-1}(Q^{(0)}_{i_n,\beta}) \cap Q^{(j)}_{j,\alpha}$ and let $q^{(j)}_\beta$ denote its center.

As Φ is C-Lipschitz,

$$d(\Phi_j(p_\alpha), \Phi_j(p_{\alpha+1})) \leq 4C \times c5^{-n}\delta_n; \tag{2.29}$$

as F_j is $\mathbf{L}(F_\infty)$-Lipschitz,

$$d(q^{(j)}_\beta, \Phi_j(p_\beta)) \leq 2\mathbf{L}(F_\infty) \times c5^{-n}\delta_n, \tag{2.30}$$

so that:

$$d(q^{(j)}_\alpha, q^{(j)}_{\alpha+1}) \leq 4(C + \mathbf{L}(F_\infty)) \times c5^{-n}\delta_n. \tag{2.31}$$

Let $S^{(j-1)}_{j-1} = F^{-1}_{j-1}(Q^{(j-1)}_{j-1})$ and $S^{(j)}_{j,\beta} = F_j^{-1}(Q^{(j)}_{j,\beta})$; we must have $S^{(j)}_{j,\alpha} \neq S^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1}$ and $\pi_{j-1}(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\beta)) \in S^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}$. Note that $F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\beta)$ must be at distance $\geq 5^{-n}$ from $\partial S^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}$ if $j \leq n-1$ and at distance $\geq 5^{-n-3}$ if $j = n$ (in this case we use that $p_\beta \in \hat{Q}^{(0)}_{n,\mathrm{a}}$), so that:

$$\phi(r(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\beta))) \geq 5^{-n-3}. \tag{2.32}$$

As $F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\alpha) \neq F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_{\alpha+1})$, they belong to different sheets of the double cover, and as $\pi_{j-1}(S^{(j)}_{j,\alpha})$ and $\pi_{j-1}(S^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1})$ are adjacent, we let $\hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha$ be the center of the square of $\mathrm{Sq}_{i_n}(Y_j)$ adjacent to $Q^{(j)}_{i_n,\alpha+1}$ and such that $\pi_{j-1}(F_j^{-1}(\hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha)) = \pi_{j-1}(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\alpha))$. We now have:

$$r(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\alpha)) = r(F_j^{-1}(\hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha)) \tag{2.33}$$

$$\left|\theta(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\alpha)) - \theta(F_j^{-1}(\hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha))\right| = \pi, \tag{2.34}$$

and invoking (2.7) we get:

$$d(q^{(j)}_\alpha, \hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha) \geq \frac{5^{-n-3}}{2}\delta_j \geq \frac{5^{-n-3}}{2}\delta_n. \tag{2.35}$$

But as $\hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha$ is the center of the square of $\mathrm{Sq}_{i_n}(Y_j)$ adjacent to $Q^{(j)}_{i_n,\alpha+1}$, from (2.31) we get:

$$d(q^{(j)}_\alpha, \hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha) \leq 8(C + \mathbf{L}(F_\infty)) \times c5^{-n}\delta_n. \tag{2.36}$$

Now, combining (2.36) and (2.35) and choosing $c \leq 10^{-6}/(C + \mathbf{L}(F_\infty))$ we get a contradiction and conclude that $Q^{(j)}_{j,\alpha} = Q^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1}$.

A consequence of the previous discussion, specialized to $j = n$, is that $\Phi_n(p_1)$ and $\Phi_n(p_t)$ belong to the same sheet of the double cover $P^{-1}_{n-1}(\hat{Q}^{(n-1)}_{n-1,\mathrm{a}}) \cap Y_n \to \hat{Q}^{(n-1)}_{n-1,\mathrm{a}}$, while the choice of c gives:

$$d(F_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(p_1)), F_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(p_t))) \leq 5^{-n-3}, \tag{2.37}$$

which contradicts **(ShSep)**.

Let now R_A denote the interior of the/a square of A that K misses. For each of the $\approx 5^{i_n - n}$ annuli we can find such a square and group them in a set $\mathrm{Holes}(Q^{(0)}_{n-1})$, and we have that:

$$\mathcal{H}^2\left(\mathrm{Holes}(Q^{(0)}_{n-1})\right) \geq \gamma\delta_n \mathcal{H}^2(Q^{(0)}_{n-1}) \tag{2.38}$$

for a constant $\gamma > 0$ which does not depend on n or $Q^{(0)}_{n-1}$. We thus conclude that

$$\mathcal{H}^2(K) \leq \mathcal{H}^2\left(Y_0 \setminus \bigcup_{Q^{(0)}_{n-1} \in \mathrm{Sq}_{n-1}(Y_0)} \mathrm{Holes}(Q^{(0)}_{n-1})\right) \leq (1-\gamma\delta_n)\mathcal{H}^2(Y_0). \tag{2.39}$$

`Step 3: Cumulating the effects of holes and the choice of` $\{\delta_n\}$.

Let Q_0 denote the unique square of $\mathrm{Sq}_0(Y_0)$. By `Step 2` we have:

$$\mathcal{H}^2(K) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(Y_0 \setminus \bigcup \mathrm{Holes}(Q_0)) \leq (1-\gamma\delta_1)\mathcal{H}^2(Y_0). \tag{2.40}$$

Now $\mathrm{Holes}(Q_0)$ consists of squares of generation $< k_2 = 1 + \lfloor G \log(1/\delta_1) \rfloor$ where G is an appropriate constant which depends on c and C. As squares are nested, if we apply `Step 2` on each of the squares of $\mathrm{Sq}_{k_2}(Y_0)$ which do not intersect the interior of $\bigcup \mathrm{Holes}(Q_0)$ we get:

$$\mathcal{H}^2(K) \leq (1-\gamma\delta_1)(1-\gamma\delta_{k_2}). \tag{2.41}$$

In general, we can reiterate, and get:

$$\mathcal{H}^2(K) \leq \prod_j (1-\gamma\delta_{k_j}), \tag{2.42}$$

where $k_1 = 1$ and $k_{j+1} = k_j + \lfloor G \log(1/\delta_i) \rfloor$. If we had

$$\sum_j \delta_{k_j} = \infty \tag{2.43}$$

we would finish obtaining the contradiction $\mathcal{H}^2(K) = 0$.

We show that (2.43) holds if $\delta_n = \frac{1}{10+n}$. For simplicity we assume that logarithms are in base 10. We use the estimate:

$$\sum_{j=10^t}^{10^{t+1}} \frac{1}{j} \geq \frac{\log 10^{t+1} - \log 10^t}{16} = \frac{1}{16}. \tag{2.44}$$

If $k_i \in (10^t, 10^{t+1})$ then k_i and k_{i+1} are separated by a distance $\leq 23(t+1)$. Hence we have:

$$\sum_{10^t \leq k_i < 10^{t+1}} \delta_{k_i} \geq \frac{1}{42(t+1)}. \tag{2.45}$$

We thus have:

$$\sum_j \delta_{k_j} \geq \lim_{T\to\infty} \sum_{t=2}^{T} \frac{1}{42(t+1)} = \infty. \tag{2.46}$$

□

3. 2-current in $\mathbb{R}^4$

In $\mathbb{R}^4$ we have both to construct the metric spaces X_n and the embeddings as the construction cannot be self-similar.

Construction 3.1 (2-Normal current in $\mathbb{R}^4$)**.** `Step 1: Affine approximation of` Ψ_δ`.`

Let Q, $\tilde{Q}$, Ψ_δ, etc... be as in Construction 2.1. Thee maps h_1, h_2 and ϕ are piecewise-affine, while θ and r, which are defined on Σ, are not so. However, by taking iterated subdivisions of Q and $\tilde{Q}$, we can approximate θ and r by maps which are affine on each square of $\Sigma^{(N)}$; letting $N \to \infty$ one can take the approximations as close as one wants in the uniform topology while keeping the Lipschitz constants bounded. Thus, there are an $N \in \mathbb{N}$, independent of δ, and a piecewise-affine map

$$\Phi_\delta : \tilde{Q}^{(N)} \to \mathbb{R}^2 \tag{3.2}$$

such that the corresponding of (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9) hold:

$$\mathbf{L}(\Phi_\delta) \in \big[\frac{\delta}{16}, 23\delta\big] \tag{3.3}$$

$$\|\Phi_\delta(p_1) - \Phi_\delta(p_2)\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \geq \frac{\delta}{3}\phi(r(p_1)) \tag{3.4}$$

$$\|\Phi_\delta\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \leq 2\delta \operatorname{diam} Q. \tag{3.5}$$

`Step 2: Construction of` F_1`.`

Let $X_0 = [0,1]^2$ and $F_0 : X_0 \to e_1 \oplus e_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ be the standard isometric embedding; X_1 is obtained by applying to X_0 Construction 2.1 as in the l^2-case and then we let:

$$F_1 = F_0 \circ \pi_{1,0} + \Phi_{\delta_1} \otimes (e_3 \oplus e_4). \tag{3.6}$$

Note that we have bounds on the Lipschitz constant of F_1:

$$\mathbf{L}(F_1) \in \big[\frac{(1+\delta_1^2)^{1/2}}{16}, 23(1+\delta_1^2)^{1/2}\big] \tag{3.7}$$

and that because of (3.4) F_1 is a topological embedding, being injective. Let $\mathrm{Sq}(X_1)$ denote the set of squares of X_1 and let $Y_1 = F_1(X_1)$. As F_1 is piecewise affine, each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_1)$ determines a unique affine 2-plane $\tau(Q) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ which contains $F_1(Q)$; the corresponding unique 2-plane parallel to $\tau(Q)$ and passing through the origin will be denoted by $\tau_0(Q)$; we finally let:

$$\mathrm{Th}(1) = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_1)} \tau(Q) \tag{3.8}$$

$$\mathrm{Th}_0(1) = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_1)} \tau_0(Q), \tag{3.9}$$

and note that both sets are finite.

`Step 3: The Radial Basis Neighbourhood.`

For $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_1)$ we let $\pi_{\tau(Q)}$ denote the orthogonal projection onto $\tau(Q)$ and define the **radial-basis function**:

(3.10)

$$\varphi_Q(x) = \begin{cases} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma_1}{\mathrm{dist}(\pi_{\tau(Q)}(x), F_1(\partial Q))}\right) \times 46 \operatorname{diam}(F_1(Q)) & \text{if } \pi_{\tau(Q)} \in \mathrm{Int}(F_1(Q)) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\sigma_1 > 0$ is a parameter to be chosen later. We then define the **radial basis neighbourhood**:

$$\mathrm{RN}(1) = \Big\{ p \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \text{there is a } Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_1) : p = x + y, x \in F_1(Q), \\ y \perp \tau(Q), \text{and } \|y\| \leq \varphi_Q(x) \Big\}. \tag{3.11}$$

RN(1) is not a neighbourhood of Y_1 as about each point of $F_1(\partial Q)$ it has empty interior; however, it is close to being a neighbourhood of Y_1 as it contains a neigbhbourhood of:

$$\bigcup_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_1)} \mathrm{Int}(F_1(Q)). \tag{3.12}$$

We define $P_1 : \mathrm{RN}(1) \to Y_1$ by $p = x + y \mapsto x$. Note that if σ_1 is sufficiently large P_1 is well-defined (see Lemma 3.37), and that:

(Claim1): For each $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ there is a $\sigma_1 > 0$ such that P_1 is $(1+\varepsilon_1)$-Lipschitz.

`Step 4: The adaptative subdivision of` X_1 `and the construction of` X_2`.`

Let $\mathrm{Sk}_1(X_1)$ denote the 1-skeleton of X_1 (i.e. the union of 1-and-0-dimensional cells) and $\mathrm{Sq}_k(X_1)$ the set of squares obtained by subdividing the squares of $\mathrm{Sq}(X_1)$ k-times (i.e. we get 5^{2k}-isometric subsquares from each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_1)$). Let

$$\mathrm{Sq}_\infty(X_1) = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \mathrm{Sq}_k(X_1); \tag{3.13}$$

we say that $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_\infty(X_1)$ is **adapted** to RN(1) if the $(23\delta_1 \operatorname{diam} F_1(Q))$-neighborhood of $F_1(Q)$ is contained in RN(1) and if, denoting by $\mathrm{PAR}(Q) \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_1)$ the unique square containing Q, one has:

$$\max_{x \in Q} \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial Q) \leq \delta_1 \max_{x \in Q} \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial \mathrm{PAR}(Q)). \tag{3.14}$$

Now the set of adapted squares is partially ordered by inclusion and we let $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)$ denote the set of its maximal elements. Note that the elements of $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)$ must have pairwise disjoint interia and:

$$X_1 \setminus \mathrm{Sk}_1(X_1) = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)} Q. \tag{3.15}$$

We obtain X_2 from X_1 by applying Construction 2.1 to each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)$, and subdividing the resulting squares N-times as in `Step 1`. Now X_2 is not a square complex, but it is almost so. First, X_2 is the limit on an admissible inverse system in the sense of Definition 3.1 in [Sch15]. As on X_0 and X_1 we considered the canonical measures constructed in Section 2, we obtain a canonical measure μ_2 on X_2 so that (X_2, μ_2) is a $(1,1)$-PI space (see Theorem 3.8 in [Sch15]). As the metric on X_2 we will consider the length metric and we observe that X_2 is doubling with doubling constant ≤ 15. We also obtain a 1-Lipschitz map $\pi_{2,1} : X_2 \to X_1$ as the inverse limit system associated to X_2 is built on top of X_1. By Theorem 3.20 in [Sch15] we obtain a 2-dimensional simple normal current N_2 with $\|N_2\| = \mu_2$ and $\pi_{2,1\#} N_2 = N_1$, N_1 being the canonical normal current associated to X_1.

Second $\mathrm{Sk}_1(X_1)$ embedds isometrically in X_2 and, away from $\mathrm{Sk}_1(X_1)$, X_2 has a square complex structure. In fact, each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)$ gives rise to at most

$10 \times 5^{N+7}$ squares in X_2; we thus denote the set of such squares by $\mathrm{Sq}(X_2)$ and let:

$$\mathrm{Sk}_1(X_2) = \mathrm{Sk}_1(X_1) \cup \bigcup_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_2)} \mathrm{Sk}_1(Q). \tag{3.16}$$

`Step 5: The construction of` F_2`.`

To get X_2 we have applied to each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)$ Construction 2.1 and we have further subdivided N-times the squares of the branched cover $\tilde{Q} \to Q$ so that we can define $\Phi_{Q,\delta_2} : \tilde{Q} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as in `Step 1`. However, we need a bit extra care to get finitely many possibilities for the tangent space of Y_2: this will be useful in the proof of Lemma 3.37.

First, for $Q_1 \neq Q_2 \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)$ the maps Φ_{Q_1,δ_2} and Φ_{Q_2,δ_2} can be taken to be the same up to composition with translations and dilations. Second, each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)$ belongs to a unique parent $\mathrm{PAR}(Q) \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_1)$. As $\mathrm{Th}_0(1)$ is finite, we can choose a finite set of pairs $\{(e_{1,Q}, e_{2,Q})\}_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)}$ such that each pair $(e_{1,Q}, e_{2,Q})$ is an orthonormal basis of the 2-plane orthogonal to $\tau_0(\mathrm{PAR}(Q))$. We let:

$$F_2(x) = F_1 \circ \pi_{2,1}(x) + \sum_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)} \Phi_{Q,\delta_2}(x) \otimes (e_{1,Q} \oplus e_{2,Q}), \tag{3.17}$$

and observe that by (3.4) F_2 is a topological embedding. As X_2 is a length space and as Φ_{Q,δ_2} adds a contribution to the gradient of F_1 orthogonally to $\tau_0(\mathrm{PAR}(Q))$, we get:

$$16^{-1}(1 + \delta_1^2 + \delta_2^2)^{1/2} \leq \mathbf{L}(F_2) \leq 23(1 + \delta_1^2 + \delta_2^2)^{1/2}, \tag{3.18}$$

and we also have:

$$\|F_1 \circ \pi_{2,1} - F_2\|_\infty \leq 56 \times 5^{-2}\delta_2. \tag{3.19}$$

Let $Y_2 = F_2(X_2)$ and note that F_2 is affine when restricted to each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_2)$. We let $\tau(F_2(Q))$ denote the affine 2-plane containing $F_2(Q)$ and $\tau_0(F_2(Q))$ the corresponding 2-plane passing through the origin. We finally let

$$\mathrm{Th}(2) = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_2)} \tau(Q) \tag{3.20}$$

$$\mathrm{Th}_0(2) = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_2)} \tau_0(Q), \tag{3.21}$$

and note that $\mathrm{Th}_0(2)$ is finite by the choice of $\{(e_{1,Q}, e_{2,Q})\}_{Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_1)}$ (while $\mathrm{Th}(2)$ is not finite). By construction we also have the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_2 & \xrightarrow{F_2} & Y_2 \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{2,1}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_1} \\ X_1 & \xrightarrow{F_1} & Y_1 \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{1,0}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_0} \\ X_0 & \xrightarrow[F_0]{} & Y_0 \end{array} \tag{3.22}$$

`Step 6: The general iteration.`

Assume we have constructed $\{X_k\}_{k\leq j}$, $\{\mathrm{RN}(k)\}_{k\leq j-1}$ and $\{F_k\}_{k\leq j}$; for $Q\in \mathrm{Sq}(X_j)$ we define the **radial basis function**:

(3.23)
$$\varphi_Q(x)=\begin{cases}\exp\left(-\frac{\sigma_j}{\mathrm{dist}(\pi_{\tau(Q)}(x),F_j(\partial Q))}\right)\times 46\,\mathrm{diam}(F_j(Q)) & \text{if } \pi_{\tau(Q)}\in F_j(\mathrm{Int}(Q))\\ 0 & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

where $\sigma_j>0$ is a parameter to be chosen later. We then define the **radial basis neighbourhood**:

$$\mathrm{RN}(j)=\Big\{p\in\mathbb{R}^4 : \text{there is a } Q\in\mathrm{Sq}(X_j) : p=x+y, x\in F_j(Q), \\ y\perp\tau(Q), \text{and } \|y\|\leq\varphi_Q(x)\Big\}. \tag{3.24}$$

As for $\mathrm{RN}(1)$, $\mathrm{RN}(j)$ is not a neighbourhood of Y_j but it is a neighbourhood of

$$\bigcup_{Q\in\mathrm{Sq}(X_j)}\mathrm{Int}(F_j(Q)). \tag{3.25}$$

We define $P_j:\mathrm{RN}(j)\to Y_j$ by $p=x+y\mapsto x$ and will later show that if σ_j is sufficiently large, P_j is well-defined (see Lemma 3.37), and that:

(Claim j): For each $\varepsilon_j>0$ there is a $\sigma_j>0$ such that P_j is $(1+\varepsilon_j)$-Lipschitz.

We then define as above:

$$\mathrm{Sq}_\infty(X_j)=\bigcup_{k\geq 1}\mathrm{Sq}_k(X_j); \tag{3.26}$$

we say that $Q\in\mathrm{Sq}_\infty(X_j)$ is **adapted** to $\mathrm{RN}(j)$ if the $(23\delta_j\,\mathrm{diam}\,F_j(Q))$-neighborhood of $F_j(Q)$ is contained in $\mathrm{RN}(j)$ and if, denoting by $\mathrm{PAR}(Q)\in\mathrm{Sq}(X_1)$ the unique square containing Q, one has:

$$\max_{x\in Q}\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial Q)\leq\delta_j\max_{x\in Q}\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathrm{PAR}(Q)). \tag{3.27}$$

As above we let $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)$ be the set of maximal adapted squares, which must then have pairwise disjoint interia and satisfy:

$$X_j\setminus\mathrm{Sk}_1(X_j)=\bigcup_{Q\in\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)}Q. \tag{3.28}$$

We obtain X_{j+1} from X_j by applying Construction 2.1 to each $Q\in\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)$ and subdividing the obtained squares other N-times. As discussed above, X_{j+1} is not a square complex, but it is almost so. In fact, X_{j+1} is the limit of an admissible inverse system in the sense of Definition 3.1 of [Sch15]. We get a 1-Lipschitz map $\pi_{j+1,j}:(X_{j+1},\mu_{j+1})\to(X_j,\mu_j)$ and X_{j+1} is a doubling length space with doubling constant ≤ 50 (the projection of a square of $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)$ contains at most 50 squares of 1/5-the side length). As in `Step 4` we find that to X_{j+1} is canonically associated a normal metric current N_{j+1} with $\pi_{j+1,j\#}N_{j+1}=N_j$ and $\|N_{j+1}\|=\|N_j\|$. We let $\mathrm{Sq}(X_{j+1})$ be the corresponding set of squares of X_{j+1}, which has a square-complex structure away from:

$$\mathrm{Sk}_1(X_{j+1})=\bigcup_{k\leq j}\mathrm{Sk}_1(X_j)\cup\bigcup_{Q\in\mathrm{Sq}(X_{j+1})}\mathrm{Sk}_1(Q); \tag{3.29}$$

note also that:

$$X_{j+1} \setminus \bigcup_{k\le j} \mathrm{Sk}_1(X_j) = \bigcup_{Q\in \mathrm{Sq}(X_{j+1})} Q. \tag{3.30}$$

To construct F_{j+1} we proceed as for F_2: for $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)$ we choose $\Phi_{Q,\delta_{j+1}} : \tilde{Q} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ such that for $Q_1 \neq Q_2$ the maps $\Phi_{Q_1,\delta_{j+1}}$ and $\Phi_{Q_2,\delta_{j+1}}$ can be taken to differ up to composition with translations and dilations. Secondly, each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)$ belongs to a unique parent $\mathrm{PAR}(Q) \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_j)$ and $\mathrm{Th}_0(j)$ is finite. Thus we can choose a finite set of pairs $\{(e_{1,Q}, e_{2,Q})\}_{Q\in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)}$ such that each $(e_{1,Q}, e_{2,Q})$ is an orthonormal basis of the orthogonal complement of $\tau_0(\mathrm{PAR}(Q))$. We define:

$$F_{j+1}(x) = F_j \circ \pi_{j+1,j}(x) + \sum_{Q\in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)} \Phi_{Q,\delta_{j+1}}(x) \otimes (e_{1,Q} \oplus e_{2,Q}), \tag{3.31}$$

and observe that by (3.4) F_{j+1} is a topological embedding. As X_{j+1} is a length space and as $\Phi_{Q,\delta_{j+1}}$ adds a contribution to the gradient of F_j orthogonally to $\tau_0(\mathrm{PAR}(Q))$, we get:

$$16^{-1}(1 + \sum_{l=1}^{j+1} \delta_l^2)^{1/2} \le \mathbf{L}(F_{j+1}) \le 23(1 + \sum_{l=1}^{j+1} \delta_l^2)^{1/2}, \tag{3.32}$$

and we also have:

$$\|F_j \circ \pi_{j+1,j} - F_{j+1}\|_\infty \le 56 \times 5^{-j}\delta_{j+1}. \tag{3.33}$$

Let $Y_{j+1} = F_{j+1}(X_{j+1})$ and note that F_{j+1} is affine when restricted to each $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_{j+1})$; as in `Step 5` we define $\tau(F_{j+1}(Q))$, $\tau_0(F_{j+1}(Q))$, $\mathrm{Th}(j+1)$ and $\mathrm{Th}_0(j+1)$, and observe that $\mathrm{Th}_0(j+1)$ is finite.

Finally for $j \le k$ one has the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{j+1} & \xrightarrow{F_{j+1}} & Y_{j+1} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{j+1,k}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_k \circ P_{k-1} \circ \cdots \circ P_j} \\ X_k & \xrightarrow{F_k} & Y_k \end{array} \tag{3.34}$$

Lemma 3.35 (Convergence of the spaces and currents)**.** *The metric measure spaces (X_n, μ_n) converge in the mGH-sense to (X_∞, μ_∞); having arranged convergence in a container, the normal currents N_n converge weakly to a normal current N_∞ supported in X_∞ with $\|N_\infty\| = \mu_\infty$; the maps $\pi_{n,i} : X_n \to X_i$ also converge to 1-Lipschitz maps $\pi_{\infty,i} : X_\infty \to X_i$ as $n \nearrow \infty$ and, for each pair $l < i$, one has commutative diagrams:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X_\infty, \mu_\infty, N_\infty) & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\infty,i}} & (X_i, \mu_i, N_i) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{\infty,l}} & \swarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{i,l}} & \\ (X_l, \mu_l, N_l) & & \end{array} \tag{3.36}$$

Proof. The proof is routine as (X_∞, μ_∞) is an inverse limit of the metric measure spaces (X_k, μ_k). Even though here we work with a slightly more general cube

complexes (in X_k we allow cells of of different diameters), the same arguments as in [Sch15, Sec. 3] go through. □

Lemma 3.37 (Proof of (**Claim**j))**.** *If the δ_k's are chosen so that:*

$$4 \cdot 10^3 \left(1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} \delta_k^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \delta_k^2\right) < \frac{1}{8}, \tag{3.38}$$

then (**Claim** j) *holds.*

Proof. `Step 1: The case` $j = 1$.

As Th(1) is finite and F_1 is an isometric embedding plus a small Lipschitz perturbation, we can find an $\alpha > 0$ such that if $\{Q_1, Q_2\} \subset \mathrm{Sq}(X_1)$ are distinct and $x_t \in F(Q_t)$ $(t = 1, 2)$ then:

$$\|x_1 - x_2\| \geq \alpha \max_{t=1,2} \mathrm{dist}(x_t, F_1(\partial Q_t)). \tag{3.39}$$

Let $x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2 \in \mathrm{RN}(1)$; then

$$\|y_t\| \leq c(\sigma_1)\, \mathrm{dist}(x_t, F_1(\partial Q_t)), \tag{3.40}$$

where $\lim_{\sigma_1 \to \infty} c(\sigma_1) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\|(x_1 + y_1) - (x_2 + y_2)\|_2 \geq \|x_1 - x_2\| - c(\sigma_1)(\|y_1\| + \|y_2\|), \tag{3.41}$$

from which we get:

$$\left(1 + \frac{2}{\alpha} c(\sigma_1)\right) \|(x_1 + y_1) - (x_2 + y_2)\| \geq \|x_1 - x_2\| = \|P_1(x_1 + y_1) - P_1(x_2 + y_2)\|. \tag{3.42}$$

Choosing σ_1 sufficiently small we obtain that P_1 is well-defined and $(1+\varepsilon_1)$-Lipschitz (note that for the case in which $Q_1 = Q_2$ we have $\alpha = 1$ in (3.42)).

`Step 2: The case` $j > 1$.

By induction we assume the existence of $\eta > 0$ such that if $k \leq j-1$, $x_t \in F_k(Q_t)$ ($t = 1, 2$ and $Q_t \in \mathrm{Sq}(X_k)$) where $Q_1 \neq Q_2$, then:

$$\|x_1 - x_2\| \geq \eta \max_{t=1,2} \mathrm{dist}(x_t, F_k(\partial Q_t)). \tag{3.43}$$

We want to establish an analogue of (3.42), but we will need to consider 3 possibilities; we define:

$$P_{i,k} = P_k \circ \cdots \circ P_{i-1} \circ P_i \quad \text{(compare (3.58))}, \tag{3.44}$$

and we let $Q_{k,t}$ denote the square of $\mathrm{Sq}(X_k)$ containing $F_k^{-1}(P_{j-1,k}(x_t))$.

First assume thar for some $k \leq j-1$ $Q_{k,1} \neq Q_{k,2}$ and let k_0 be the minimal value of k such that this happens. Then:

$$\|P_{j-1,k_0}(x_1) - P_{j-1,k_0}(x_2)\| \geq \eta \max_{t=1,2} \mathrm{dist}(P_{j-1,k_0}(x_t), F_{k_0}(\partial Q_{k_0,t})). \tag{3.45}$$

By induction we will assume that P_{j-1,k_0} is well-defined with $\mathbf{L}(P_{j-1,k_0}) < \infty$. Let $q_t \in F_{k_0}(\partial Q_{k_0,t})$ be a closest point to x_t. As $F_{k_0}|Q_{k_0,t}$ is affine satisfying (3.32), we conclude that:

$$\frac{\|P_{j-1,k_0}(x_t) - q_t\|}{d(F_{k_0}^{-1}(P_{j-1,k_0}(x_t)), F_{k_0}^{-1}(q_t))} \in \left[\frac{(1 + \sum_{k \leq k_0} \delta_k^2)^{1/2}}{16}, 23(1 + \sum_{k \leq k_0} \delta_k^2)^{1/2}\right]. \tag{3.46}$$

For $k_0 < k \leq j-1$ let $Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{k,t}$ denote the square of $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_{k-1})$ containing $\pi_{k,k-1}(Q_{k,t})$. From the definition of F_k we get:

(3.47)
$$x_t - P_{j-1,k_0}(x_t) = \sum_{k_0+1\leq k\leq j} \Phi_{Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{k,t},\delta_k}(\pi_{j,k}\circ F_j^{-1}(x_t)) \otimes (e_{1,Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{k,t}} \oplus e_{2,Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{k,t}}).$$

From the bound on the Lipschitz constant of $\Phi_{Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{k,t},\delta_k}$ we get:

$$\|\Phi_{Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{k,t},\delta_k}(\pi_{j,k}\circ F_j^{-1}(x_t))\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \leq 28\delta_k \operatorname{dist}(\pi_{j,k}\circ F_j^{-1}(x_t), \partial Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{k,t}); \tag{3.48}$$

recall from `Step 6` in 3.1 that $\partial Q_{k_0,t}$ is isometrically embedded in X_k for $k \geq k_0$; as geodesic paths joining a point $p \in X_k$ to a point $q \in \mathrm{Sk}_1(X_k)$ can be taken not to pass through different sheets of the double covers and, minding (3.27), we have for $k_0 < k \leq j-1$:

$$\operatorname{dist}(\pi_{j,k}\circ F_j^{-1}(x_t), \partial Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{k,t}) \leq \delta_k \operatorname{dist}(\pi_{j,k_0}\circ F_j^{-1}(x_t), \partial Q_{k_0,t}). \tag{3.49}$$

Commbining (3.47), (3.48) and (3.49) we get:

$$\|x_t - P_{j-1,k_0}(x_t)\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \leq 28\left(\sum_{k_0<k\leq j}\delta_k^2\right)\operatorname{dist}(\pi_{j,k_0}\circ F_j^{-1}(x_t), \partial Q_{k_0,t}). \tag{3.50}$$

Recalling (3.47)

$$\|x_t - q_t\| \leq \|P_{j-1,k_0}(x_t) - q_t\| + 28\times 16(1+\sum_{k\leq k_0}\delta_k^2)^{1/2}\|P_{j-1,k_0}(x_t) - q_t\|, \tag{3.51}$$

and the choice (3.38) of the sequence $\{\delta_k\}_k$, we get:

$$\|x_t - q_t\| \leq \frac{9}{8}\|P_{j-1,k_0}(x_t) - q_t\|. \tag{3.52}$$

Now:

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_1 - x_2\| &\geq \frac{1}{\mathbf{L}(P_{j-1,k_0})}\|P_{j-1,k_0}(x_1) - P_{j-1,k_0}(x_2)\| \\ &\geq \frac{\eta}{\mathbf{L}(P_{j-1,k_0})}\max_{t=1,2}\operatorname{dist}(\pi_{j,k_0}\circ F_j^{-1}(x_t), \partial Q_{k_0,t}) \\ &\geq \frac{8\eta}{9\mathbf{L}(P_{j-1,k_0})\mathbf{L}(F_{k_0})}\operatorname{dist}(x_t, F_{k_0}(\partial Q_{k_0,t})).\end{aligned} \tag{3.53}$$

If $x_t + y_t \in \mathrm{RN}(j)$ then

$$\|(x_1+y_1)-(x_2+y_2)\| \geq \|x_1-x_2\| - c(\sigma_2)(\|y_1\|+\|y_2\|), \tag{3.54}$$

where $\lim_{\sigma_2\to\infty} c(\sigma_2) = 0$, and we can conclude as in `Step 1`.

In the second case assume that $Q_{j-1,1} = Q_{j-1,2}$ but $Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{j-1,1} \neq Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{j-1,2}$. Then $P_{j-1}(x_1)$ and $P_{j-1}(x_2)$ lie on the same affine plane of $\mathrm{Th}(j-1)$ and thus:

$$\|P_{j-1}(x_1) - P_{j-1}(x_2)\| \geq \max_{t=1,2}\operatorname{dist}(P_{j-1}(x_t), F_{j-1}(\partial Q_{k_0,t})), \tag{3.55}$$

and we can then argue as in the first case.

Third, if $Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{j-1,1} = Q^{(\mathrm{par})}_{j-1,2}$ we can argue as in `Step 1`. In fact, by `Step 6` in Construction 3.1 the set $\mathrm{Th}_0(j-1)$ is finite and, up to translations and dilations, there are only finitely many possibilities for the subcomplexes of Y_j which project via P_{j-1} onto some $F_{j-1}(Q)$ for $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_{j-1})$. Thus we can find an $\alpha > 0$ such

that if $\{Q_1, Q_2\} \subset \mathrm{Sq}(X_j)$ are distinct, $x_t \in F(Q_t)$ $(t = 1, 2)$ and $\pi_{j,j-1}(Q_1)$ and $\pi_{j,j-1}(Q_2)$ belong to the same square of $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_{j-1})$ then

$$\|x_1 - x_2\| \geq \alpha \max_{t=1,2} \mathrm{dist}(x_t, F_j(\partial Q_t)), \tag{3.56}$$

and then argue as in `Step 1`. □

Lemma 3.57 (Compositions of P_i are uniformly Lipschitz)**.** *Assume that $\sum_t \varepsilon_t < \infty$; then the Lipschitz maps $P_i : \mathrm{RN}(i) \to Y_i$ can be composed to give uniformly Lipschitz maps; specifically, for $k < i$ let:*

$$P_{i,k} = P_k \circ \cdots \circ P_{i-1} \circ P_i; \tag{3.58}$$

then:

$$\mathbf{L}(P_{i,k}) \leq \prod_t (1 + \varepsilon_t). \tag{3.59}$$

Let $F_i(X_i) = Y_i$ ($i = \infty$ is admissible); then the maps

$$P_{i,k} : \mathrm{RN}(i) \to Y_k \tag{3.60}$$

as $i \nearrow \infty$ converge weak to a map:*

$$P_{\infty,k} : Y_\infty \to Y_k \tag{3.61}$$

which satisfies $\mathbf{L}(P_{\infty,k}) \leq \prod_t (1 + \varepsilon_t)$. For $k < l \leq i$ (i or l can be ∞ with $P_{\infty,\infty}$ being taken to be the identity of Y_∞) one has:

$$P_{l,k} \circ P_{i,l} = P_{i,k}; \tag{3.62}$$

as $k \nearrow \infty$ $P_{\infty,k}$ converges weak to $P_{\infty,\infty}$.*

Proof. Assuming that $\sum_t \varepsilon_t < \infty$ we have a uniform bound on the Lipschitz constants of the maps $P_{i,k}$:

$$\sup_{i,k} \mathbf{L}(P_{i,k}) \leq \prod_t (1 + \varepsilon_t) < \infty. \tag{3.63}$$

From the definition of $\mathrm{RN}(i)$ we get that if $\sigma_i > 1$ (note that the σ_i's are chosen very large in Lemma 3.37) we have:

$$\sup_{x \in \mathrm{RN}(i)} \|P_i(x) - x\| \leq 100 \cdot 5^{-i}. \tag{3.64}$$

In particular, for a universal constant $C > 0$ we have:

$$\sup_l \sup_{x \in \mathrm{RN}(i+l)} \|P_{i+l,k}(x) - P_{i,k}(x)\| \leq C 5^{-i}. \tag{3.65}$$

Therefore, on Y_∞ the maps $P_{i,k}$ converge, uniformly as $i \nearrow \infty$ to a map $P_{\infty,k}$ which must be Lipschitz because of (3.63); the uniform bound (3.63) also ensures that convergence is in the weak* sense.

From the definition of $P_{i,k}$ we have that (3.62) holds when all of $\{i, l, k\}$ are finite. For $l = \infty$ or $i = \infty$ we establish the result by a limiting argument setting $P_{\infty,\infty}$ equal to the identity of Y_∞. We are thus only left to show that $P_{\infty,k}$ converges on Y_k uniformly to the identity. But this is immediate observing that (3.64) gives:

$$\sup_{x \in Y_\infty = \bigcap_k \mathrm{RN}(k)} \|P_{k,\infty}(x) - x\| \leq 10^3 \times 5^{-k}. \tag{3.66}$$

□

Lemma 3.67 (Convergence of the Embeddings)**.** *The topological embeddings $F_i : X_i \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ converge, as $i \nearrow \infty$, to a topological embedding $F_\infty : X_\infty \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ such that:*

$$16^{-1}\big(1+\sum_i \delta_i^2\big)^{1/2} \leq \mathbf{L}(F_\infty) \leq 23\big(1+\sum_i \delta_i^2\big)^{1/2}. \tag{3.68}$$

For each $k < i$ ($i = \infty$ being admissible) one has a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_i & \xrightarrow{F_i} & Y_i \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_{i,k}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle P_{i,k}} \\ X_k & \xrightarrow[F_k]{} & Y_k \end{array} \tag{3.69}$$

Proof. Note that from (3.33) we have:

$$\sup_{x\in X_{i+k}} \|F_{i+k}(x) - F_i(\pi_{i+k,i}(x))\| \leq 200\cdot 5^{-i}, \tag{3.70}$$

and so the embeddings $F_i : X_i \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ converge uniformly to a map $F_\infty : X_\infty \to \mathbb{R}^4$ which must satisfy (3.68) because of (3.32).

The diagram (3.69) commutes because of (3.34) (the case $i = \infty$ is handled by a limiting argument).

Finally, as X_∞ is compact, in order to conclude that F_∞ is an embedding it suffices to establish that it is injective. Let x, y be distinct points of X_∞; then for some k: $\pi_{\infty,k}(x) \neq \pi_{\infty,k}(y)$ and, as F_k is an embedding:

$$F_k(\pi_{\infty,k}(x)) \neq F_k(\pi_{\infty,k}(y)); \tag{3.71}$$

but as the diagrams (3.69) commute:

$$P_{\infty,k}(F_\infty(x)) \neq P_{\infty,k}(F_\infty(y)). \tag{3.72}$$

□

Lemma 3.73 (Existence and nontriviality of the 2-current)**.** *The pushforward $F_{\infty\#}N_\infty$ is a nontrivial normal current in $\mathbb{R}^4$ supported on Y_∞; in fact:*

$$P_{\infty,0\#}F_{\infty\#}N_\infty = F_{0\#}N_0. \tag{3.74}$$

Proof. One just needs to prove (3.74) and might argue from the commutative diagram (3.69) for $(i,k) = (\infty, 0)$. But some sleight of hand is concealed in this approach and for the Apprehensive Analyst we provide a direct computation which uses weak* continuity of normal currents:

(3.75)
$$P_{\infty,0\#}F_{\infty\#}N_\infty(f\,dg_1\wedge df_2) = N_\infty(f\circ P_{\infty,0}\circ F_\infty\, d(g_1\circ P_{\infty,0}\circ F_\infty)\wedge d(g_2\circ P_{\infty,0}\circ F_\infty));$$

but $P_{i,0}\circ F_i\circ \pi_{\infty,i} \xrightarrow{\text{w}^*} P_{\infty,0}\circ F_\infty$ as $i\nearrow\infty$ and thus:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\infty,0\#}\circ F_{\infty\#}N_\infty &= \lim_{i\to\infty} N_\infty\big[(P_{i,0}\circ F_i\circ \pi_{i,\infty})^* f\,dg_1\wedge dg_2\big] \\ &= \lim_{i\to\infty} N_i((P_{i,0}\circ F_i)^* f\,dg_1\wedge dg_2) \\ &= \lim_{i\to\infty} P_{i,0\#}F_{i\#}N_i(f\,dg_1\wedge dg_2) = F_{0\#}N_0(f\,dg_1\wedge dg_2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.76}$$

□

Theorem 3.77 (2-unrectifiability of Y_∞)**.** *Y_∞ is purely 2-unrectifiable in the sense that whenever $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is compact and $\Phi : K \to \mathbb{R}^4$ is Lipschitz, $\mathcal{H}^2(\Phi^{-1}(Y_\infty) \cap K) = 0$.*

Proof. We will argue by contradiction assuming that $K \subset \Phi^{-1}(Y_\infty)$ and that $\mathcal{H}^2(K) > 0$. The main difference from the proof of Theorem 2.21 is `Step 1` where we resort to a weak* (approximate) lower-semicontinuity argument.

`Step 1: Reduction to the case in which` Φ `is a graph over` Y_0`.`

Let $\Phi_n = P_{\infty,n} \circ \Phi$, which are well-defined and uniformly Lipschitz. By Lemma 3.57 we also have that Φ_n converges weak* to Φ.

We now consider the Borel set $E \subset K$ consisting of those points which are Lebesgue density points of the set of points where Φ and each Φ_n is differentiable and where $d\Phi_0$ has rank < 2; our goal is to show that

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\operatorname{Im} \Phi \cap P^{-1}_{\infty,0}(\Phi_0(E))) = 0. \tag{3.78}$$

First, the area formula [AK00b, Thm. 5.1] gives $\mathcal{H}^2(Y_0 \cap \Phi_0(E)) = 0$. Secondly, for each n, using the square complex structure of $\{X_i\}_{i \le n}$, the set $Y_n \setminus F_n(\mathrm{Sk}_1(X_n))$ can be partitioned into countably many closed sets $\{S_\alpha\}_\alpha$ (e.g. taking each $F_n(Q)$ for $Q \in \mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_n)$) such that each restriction $P_{n,0}|_{S_\alpha} : S_\alpha \to P_{n,0}(S_\alpha)$ is biLipschitz, thus giving:

$$\mathcal{H}^2(Y_n \cap P^{-1}_{n,0}(\Phi_0(E))) = 0. \tag{3.79}$$

In particular, the area formula implies that:

$$\int_K \chi_E J_2(d\Phi_n)\, d\mathcal{H}^2 = 0. \tag{3.80}$$

We want to uset the lowersemicontinuity of the area functional (see for example [AFP00, Subsec. 2.6]), but we need the domain of the maps Φ_n, Φ_∞ to be open. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $U \subset E$ open with $\mathcal{H}^2(U \setminus E) < \varepsilon$. By McShane's Lemma we can extend each Φ_n to a $7C$-Lipschitz map $\tilde{\Phi}_n : U \to \mathbb{R}^4$ which coincides on E with Φ_n. Up to passing to a subsequence we can assume $\tilde{\Phi}_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}^*} \tilde{\Phi}_\infty$ were $\tilde{\Phi}_\infty | E = \Phi_\infty$. We can now invoke lower-semicontinuity of area:

(3.81)

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_K \chi_E J_2(d\Phi_\infty)\, d\mathcal{H}^2 &\le \int_U J_2(d\tilde{\Phi}_\infty)\, d\mathcal{H}^2 \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_U J_2(d\tilde{\Phi}_n)\, d\mathcal{H}^2 \\
&\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{U\setminus E} J_2(d\tilde{\Phi}_n)\, d\mathcal{H}^2 + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_E J_2(d\Phi_n)\, d\mathcal{H}^2 \\
&\le 49C^2\varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

and (3.78) follows letting $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ and applying the area formula.

`Step 2: Existence of square holes.`

The same argument as in `Step 2` of Theorem 2.21 goes through with minor modifications.

First, the (generalized) square-complex structure of $X_n \setminus \mathrm{Sk}_1(X_n)$ induces a generalized square-complex structure on $Y_n \setminus F_n(\mathrm{Sk}_1(X_n))$ via the homeomorphism F_n: thus, in the following, we will implicitly identify $\mathrm{Sq}_k(X_n)$ (resp. $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_n)$) with $\mathrm{Sq}_k(Y_n)$ (resp. $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(Y_n)$).

Second, compared to the l^2-case there are differences in indexing the $\mathrm{Sq}_*(Y_n)$, $\mathrm{Sq}_*(X_n)$. In fact, as the construction is no longer self-similar, $\mathrm{Sq}_k(X_n)$ does not

represent the set of squares of X_n of generation k (and side length 5^{-k}), but the set of squares obtained by subdividing each square of $\mathrm{Sq}(X_n)$ k-times (and so the side length is 5^{-k}-times the side length of the parent square in $\mathrm{Sq}(X_n)$). Moreover, we need a notation for the set of squares obtained by subdividing each square of $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_n)$ k-times: we will use $\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad},k}(X_n)$.

Third, in `Step 1` of Construction 3.1 we took a piecewise-affine approximation of Ψ_δ which involved subdividing squares N-extra times. We must thus modify the definition of i_n (2.28) letting:

$$i_n = \lceil -\log_5(5^{-n-N-5} c\delta_n) \rceil. \tag{3.82}$$

Fourth, we have to consider a square $Q \in P_{n-1,0}(\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad},i_n-n}(Y_{n-1}))$ and partition $\hat{Q}_{\mathrm{a}}$ into $\simeq 5^{i_n-n}$ annuli consisting of squares of $P_{n-1,0}(\mathrm{Sq}_{\mathrm{ad},i_n-n}(Y_{n-1}))$. Having fixed such an annulus A, the goal is again to show that $K = \operatorname{dom}\Phi \subset Y_0$ (we have reduced to the case in which Φ is a graph over a subset of Y_0 in the previous `Step 1`) has to miss one of the squares of A.

Then the proof follows the same logic as in `Step 2` of Theorem 2.21 with some minor notational modifications:

- $\mathrm{Sq}_j(Y_j)$ becomes $\mathrm{Sq}(Y_j)$, compare the previous discussion about idexing.
- $\mathrm{Sq}_{i_n}(Q^{(0)}_{n-1})$ becomes $\mathrm{Sq}_{i_n-n}(Q^{(0)}_{n-1})$, where $\mathrm{Sq}_k(Q)$ denotes the set of subsquares of Q obtained by taking k-iterated subdivisions.
- We cannot simply use the projejction P_0, but must use $P_{j,0}$ when projecting points from Y_j to Y_0. In particular, instead of writing $Q^{(j)}_{i_n,\beta} = P_0^{-1}(Q^{(0)}_{i_n,\beta}) \cap Q^{(j)}_{j,\alpha}$, we need to consider $Q^{(j)}_{i_n,\beta} = P_{j,0}^{-1}(Q^{(0)}_{i_n,\beta}) \cap Q^{(j)}_{j,\alpha}$.

`Step 3: The choice of the` δ_k`'s.`

Here we have to guarantee that (3.38) holds; this can be achieved by shifting the sequence we used in Theorem 2.21 to the right:

$$\delta_k = \frac{1}{10^9 + k}. \tag{3.83}$$

□

4. k-current in $\mathbb{R}^{k+2}$

The k-current in $\mathbb{R}^{k+2}$ is constructed resorting to a trick that was already employed in [Sch15, Sec. 4]: once one is able to construct a 2-current which meets all Lipschitz surfaces which are graphs over a coordinate plane in a $\mathcal{H}^2$-null set, one can iterate over all planes parallel to a pair of coordinate axes. In the following we let $\{e_\xi\}_{1\le\xi\le l}$ denote the standard orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^l$ (where $l = k$ or $l = k+2$) and for $\xi < \zeta$ we let $e_\xi \oplus e_\zeta$ denote the plane spanned by e_ξ and e_ζ. Finally, we will identify the set of planes $\{e_\xi \oplus e_\zeta\}_{1\le\xi<\zeta\le k}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_{\binom{k}{2}}$ and we will write equations like $s = e_\xi \oplus e_\zeta \mod \binom{k}{2}$ or $e_\xi \oplus e_\zeta = 2 \mod \binom{k}{2}$.

Construction 4.1 (Modifications to Construction 2.1)**.** Now Construction 2.1 is generalized adding an additional parameter: a 2-plane $e_\xi \oplus e_\zeta$. Let k be a k-cube isometric to $[0, 5^{-i}]$ and let $\mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}$ denote the projection onto $e_\xi \oplus e_\zeta$ and set

$Q = \mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}(K)$. Let Q_a, Q_c, Q_o, $\tilde{Q}$, etc... as in Construction 2.1 and set:

$$\begin{aligned} K_\mathrm{a} &= \mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}^{-1}(Q_\mathrm{a}) \\ K_\mathrm{o} &= \mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}^{-1}(Q_\mathrm{o}) \\ K_\mathrm{c} &= \mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}^{-1}(Q_\mathrm{c}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

We use standard covering theory to find a double cover $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{K}_\mathrm{a} \to K_\mathrm{a}$, and a lift $\widetilde{\mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}} : \tilde{K}_\mathrm{a} \to \tilde{Q}_\mathrm{a}$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{K}_\mathrm{a} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}} & K_\mathrm{a} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{\mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}} \\ \tilde{Q}_\mathrm{a} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_Q} & Q_\mathrm{a} \end{array} \tag{4.3}$$

where $\tilde{\pi}_Q : \tilde{Q}_\mathrm{a} \to Q_\mathrm{a}$ is the double cover from Construction 2.1. We then glue $\tilde{K}_\mathrm{a}$ back to $K_\mathrm{o} \cup K_\mathrm{c}$ by gluing together the pair of points of $\partial \tilde{K}_\mathrm{a}$ that are mapped to the same point by $\tilde{\pi}$. If $\tilde{K}$ denotes the resulting cube-complex, then $\tilde{\pi}$ extends to a branched covering $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{K} \to K$ and we also obtain an extension $\widetilde{\mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}} : \tilde{K} \to \tilde{Q}$ of $\widetilde{\mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}}|\operatorname{Int}(\tilde{K}_\mathrm{a})$ which makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{K} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}} & K \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{\mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}} \\ \tilde{Q} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_Q} & Q \end{array} \tag{4.4}$$

we then obtain $\Psi : \tilde{K} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as the composition $\Psi = \Psi_{\tilde{Q}} \circ \widetilde{\mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}}$ where $\Psi_{\tilde{Q}} : \tilde{Q} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is the map we built in Construction 2.1.

Construction 4.5 (Modification to Construction 3.1)**.** `Step 1: Piecewise affine approximation.`

For fixed δ, ξ, ζ, let $\Psi_\delta : \tilde{K} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be as in Construction 4.5 using the parameters δ, $e_\xi \oplus e_\zeta$. If $\tilde{K}^{(m)}$ denotes the m-th iterated subdivision of $\tilde{K}$, we can find $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a piecewise affine approximation $\Phi_\delta : \tilde{K}^{(N)} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ of Ψ_δ such that the following analogs of (3.3), (3.4) and (3.5) hold:

$$\mathbf{L}(\Phi_\delta) \in \left[\frac{\delta}{16}, 23\delta\right] \tag{4.6}$$

$$\|\Phi_\delta(p_1) - \Phi_\delta(p_2)\| \geq \frac{\delta}{3}\phi(r(\mathrm{pj}_{\xi,\zeta}(p_1))) \tag{4.7}$$

$$\|\Phi_\delta\| \leq 2\delta \operatorname{diam} K. \tag{4.8}$$

We let $X_0 = [0,1]^k$ and $F_0 : X_0 \to \bigoplus_{1 \leq \xi \leq k} e_\xi \subset \mathbb{R}^{k+2}$ denote the standard isometric embedding. We obtain X_1 from X_0 by applying Construction 4.1 with $e_\xi \oplus e_\zeta = 0 \mod \binom{k}{2}$ and then let

$$F_1 = F_0 \circ \pi_{1,0} + \Phi_{\delta_1} \otimes (e_{k+1} \oplus e_{k+2}). \tag{4.9}$$

`Step 2: Construction of` X_{j+1} `and` F_{j+1}`.`

We need first to generalize the notation. We let $\mathrm{Cell}(X_j)$ denote the set of k-dimensional cells of X_j; while X_1 is a k-cube complex, as in Construction 3.1, X_j does not have a k-cube complex structure, but it is a union of its k-cells $\mathrm{Cell}(X_j)$ away from the $(k-1)$-skeleton $\mathrm{Sk}_{k-1}(X_{j-1})$ of X_{j-1}, where $\mathrm{Sk}_{k-1}(X_{j-1})$ embedds isometrically in X_j. Moreover, we let $\mathrm{Sk}_{k-1}(X_j) = \mathrm{Sk}_{k-1}(X_{j-1}) \cup \bigcup_{K\in\mathrm{Cell}(X_j)} \partial K$; in particular:

$$X_j \setminus \mathrm{Sk}_{k-1}(X_j) = \bigcup_{K\in\mathrm{Cell}(X_j)} \mathrm{Int}(K). \tag{4.10}$$

For $K \in \mathrm{Cell}(X_j)$ we define the radial basis function

(4.11)

$$\varphi_K(x) = \begin{cases} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma_j}{\mathrm{dist}(\pi_{\tau(K)}(x), F_j(\partial K))}\right) \times 46\,\mathrm{diam}(F_j(K)) & \text{if } \pi_{\tau(K)} \in F_j(\mathrm{Int}(K)) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\pi_{\tau(K)}$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto the affine k-plane $\tau(K)$ containing $F_j(K)$. We then define the radial basis neighbourhood $\mathrm{RN}(j)$ as:

$$\mathrm{RN}(j) = \Big\{ p \in \mathbb{R}^{k+2} : \text{there is a } K \in \mathrm{Cell}(X_j) : p = x + y, x \in F_j(K), \\ y \perp \tau(K), \text{and } \|y\| \le \varphi_K(x) \Big\}. \tag{4.12}$$

We then define $P_j : \mathrm{RN}(j) \to Y_j$ by $p = x + y \mapsto X$ and, as in Section 3, it follows that:

(Claim j): For each $\varepsilon_j > 0$ there is a $\sigma_j > 0$ such that P_j is $(1+\varepsilon_j)$-Lipschitz.

Let $\mathrm{Cell}_m(X_j)$ denote the set of cells obtained by subdividing each cell of $\mathrm{Cell}(X_j)$ m-times, and let:

$$\mathrm{Cell}_\infty(X_j) = \bigcup_{m\ge 1} \mathrm{Cell}_m(X_j). \tag{4.13}$$

Now a cell $K \in \mathrm{Cell}_\infty(X_j)$ is adapted to $\mathrm{RN}(j)$ if the $(23\delta_j \,\mathrm{diam}\, F_j(K))$-neighborhood of $F_j(K)$ is contained in $\mathrm{RN}(j)$ and if, denoting by $\mathrm{PAR}(K) \in \mathrm{Cell}(X_j)$ the unique cell containing K, one has:

$$\max_{x\in K} \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial K) \le \delta_j \max_{x\in K} \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial \mathrm{PAR}(K)). \tag{4.14}$$

We let $\mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)$ denote the set of maximal adapted k-cubes of $\mathrm{Cell}_\infty(X_j)$; the elements of $\mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)$ have pairwise disjoint interia and satisfy:

$$X_j \setminus \mathrm{Sk}_{k-1}(X_j) = \bigcup_{K\in\mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)} \mathrm{Int}(K). \tag{4.15}$$

Fix $e_\xi \oplus e_\eta = j \mod \binom{k}{2}$ and apply Construction 4.1 to each $K \in \mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)$ to get $\Phi_{K,\delta_{j+1}} : \tilde{K} \to \mathbb{R}^2$. As in Construction 3.1 we can ensure that if $K_1 \ne K_2$ $\Phi_{K_1,\delta_{j+1}}$ and $\Phi_{K_2,\delta_{j+1}}$ can be taken to differ up to composition with translations and dilations. Let $\mathrm{Th}_0(j) = \bigcup_{K\in\mathrm{Cell}(X_j)} \tau_0(K)$ where $\tau_0(K)$ denotes the k-plane parallel to $\tau(K)$ and passing through the origin. By induction we assume $\mathrm{Th}_0(j)$ to be finite and choose a finite set of pairs $\{(e_{1,K}, e_{2,K})\}_{K\in\mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)}$ such that each

$(e_{1,K}, e_{2,K})$ is an orthonormal basis of the orthogonal complement of $\tau_0(\mathrm{PAR}(K))$ where $\mathrm{PAR}(K) \in \mathrm{Cell}(X_j)$ is the k-cell containing K. We can then define:

$$F_{j+1}(x) = F_j \circ \pi_{j+1}(x) + \sum_{K \in \mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(X_j)} \Phi_{K,\delta_{j+1}}(x) \otimes (e_{1,K} \oplus e_{2,K}), \tag{4.16}$$

and get

$$\mathbf{L}(F_{j+1}) \in \left[16^{-1}(1 + \sum_{l \le j+1} \delta_l^2)^{1/2}, 23(1 + \sum_{l \le j+1} \delta_l^2)^{1/2} \right]. \tag{4.17}$$

As in the $\mathbb{R}^4$-case we let $Y_i = F_i(X_i)$ and $Y_\infty = F_\infty(X_\infty)$.

Theorem 4.18 (2-unrectifiability of $Y_\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^{k+2}$)**.** *$Y_\infty$ is purely 2-unrectifiable in the sense that whenever $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is compact and $\Phi : K \to \mathbb{R}^{k+2}$ is Lipschitz, $\mathcal{H}^2(\Phi^{-1}(Y_\infty) \cap K) = 0$.*

Proof. We will focus on the differences with the proof of Theorem 3.77.

`Step 1: Reduction to the case in which Φ is a graph over` Y_0`.`

Let $\Phi : K \subset [0,1]^2 \to Y_\infty$ be Lipschitz with $\mathcal{H}^2(K) > 0$. Let $\Phi_n = P_{\infty,n} \circ \Phi$ and $E \subset K$ be the set of differentiability points p of $\{\Phi_n\}_n, \Phi$ such that for each pair (ξ, ζ) with $1 \le \xi < \zeta \le k$ (note the k, not $k+2$! Our construction has already screwed-up the behavior in the last two coordinates):

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \langle e_\xi, d\Phi_0(\partial_x) \rangle & \langle e_\xi, d\Phi_0(\partial_y) \rangle \\ \langle e_\zeta, d\Phi_0(\partial_x) \rangle & \langle e_\zeta, d\Phi_0(\partial_y) \rangle \end{pmatrix} (p) = 0. \tag{4.19}$$

As Y_0 lies in $\bigoplus_{\xi \le k} e_\xi$ the area formula gives:

$$\mathcal{H}^2(Y_0 \cap \Phi_0(E)) = 0. \tag{4.20}$$

Now, using that $\Phi_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{w}^*} \Phi$ and the weak* lower-semicontinuity of the area functional as in `Step 1` of Theorem 3.77 we conclude that:

$$\mathcal{H}^2(Y_\infty \cap \Phi(E)) = 0. \tag{4.21}$$

Thus, up to passing to a countable partition of K and throwing away an $\mathcal{H}^2$-null set we can assume that there are $1 \le \xi_0 < \zeta_0 \le k$ such that for each $p \in K$:

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \langle e_{\xi_0}, d\Phi_0(\partial_x) \rangle & \langle e_{\xi_0}, d\Phi_0(\partial_y) \rangle \\ \langle e_{\zeta_0}, d\Phi_0(\partial_x) \rangle & \langle e_{\zeta_0}, d\Phi_0(\partial_y) \rangle \end{pmatrix} (p) \neq 0. \tag{4.22}$$

Using [Kir94, Thm. 9] in, which is essentially a measurable and Lipschitz version of the Inverse Function Theorem, up to further partioning and throwing away an $\mathcal{H}^2$-null set we are reduced to the case $K \subset \pi_{e_{\xi_0} \oplus e_{\zeta_0}}(Y_0)$ where $\pi_{e_{\xi_0} \oplus e_{\zeta_0}}$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto $e_{\xi_0} \oplus e_{\zeta_0}$.

`Step 2: Existence of square holes.`

The proof now proceeds as in `Step 2` of Theorems 3.77, 2.21 but we spell out more details because we deal both with squares and k-dimensional cells.

Let $n-1 = e_{\xi_0} \oplus e_{\zeta_0} \mod \binom{k}{2}$ and let $Q \in \pi_{e_{\xi_0} \oplus e_{\zeta_0}}(P_{n-1,0}(\mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(Y_{n-1})))$ where

$$i_n = \lceil -\log_5(5^{-n-N-5} c \delta_n) \rceil; \tag{4.23}$$

let $\hat{Q}_{\mathrm{a}}$ be as in Construction 2.1 and partition $\hat{Q}_{\mathrm{a}}$ into $\approx 5^{i_n - n}$ annuli consisting of squares of $\mathrm{Sq}_{i_n - n}(Q)$ (i.e. subdivide Q into 25 subsquares $(i_n - n)$-times). We consider one such an annulus A. Our goal is to show that K has to miss the interior of one of the squares in A. Let p_α, $p_{\alpha+1}$ be as in `Step 2` of the proof

of Theorem 3.77, and we will show that $\Phi_j(p_\alpha)$ and $\Phi_j(p_{\alpha+1})$ belong to the same cell of $\mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(Y_j)$. This is true by construction when $j = 0$ and for $j \geq 1$ we assume by induction that $\Phi_{j-1}(p_\alpha)$, $\Phi_{j-1}(p_{\alpha+1})$ belong to the same $K^{(j-1)}_{j-1} \in \mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(Y_{j-1})$. Let $K^{(j)}_{j,\beta} \in \mathrm{Cell}_{\mathrm{ad}}(Y_j)$ denote the cell containing $\Phi_j(p_\beta)$ and assume by contradiction that $K^{(j)}_{j,\alpha} \neq K^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1}$. In the following we will use the decorators $_{\mathrm{a}}$, $_{\mathrm{o}}$, $_{\mathrm{c}}$ and $\hat{}$ as in Constructions 2.1 and 4.1: for example $\hat{K}^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}$ is obtained as $\hat{K}_{\mathrm{a}}$ if we let $K = K^{(j-1)}_{j-1}$. In particular, as $K^{(j)}_{j,\alpha} \neq K^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1}$ we must have $P_{j-1}(K^{(j)}_{j,\beta}) \subset K^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}$. Let now $Q^{(0)}_{i_n,\beta} \in \pi_{e_{\xi_0} \oplus e_{\zeta_0}}(P_{j-1,0}(\mathrm{Cell}_{i_n-j+1}(Y_{j-1})))$ be the square containing p_β. Note that $Q^{(0)}_{i_n,\beta} \subset Q$ can be identified with a square of an iterated subdivision of Q, more precisely, $Q^{(0)}_{i_n,\beta} \in \mathrm{Sq}_{i_n-n}(Q)$. Let $K^{(j)}_{i_n,\beta} = P^{-1}_{j,0}(Q^{(0)}_{i_n,\beta}) \cap K^{(j)}_{j,\beta}$, and let $q^{(j)}_\beta$ denote the center of the cell $K^{(j)}_{i_n,\beta}$. As Φ is C-Lipschitz:

$$d(\Phi_j(p_\alpha), \Phi_j(p_{\alpha+1})) \leq 4\sqrt{k}C \times c\delta_n \operatorname{diam} Q. \tag{4.24}$$

As F_j is $\mathbf{L}(F_\infty)$-Lipschitz and as $\operatorname{diam} F_j^{-1}(K^{(j)}_{j,\beta}) \leq 2c\delta_n\sqrt{k} \operatorname{diam} Q$,

$$d(q^{(j)}_\beta, \Phi_j(p_\beta)) \leq 2\sqrt{k}\mathbf{L}(F_\infty) \times c\delta_n \operatorname{diam} Q \tag{4.25}$$

$$d(q^{(j)}_\alpha, q^{(j)}_{\alpha+1}) \leq 4(\sqrt{k}C + \mathbf{L}(F_\infty)) \times c\delta_n \operatorname{diam} Q. \tag{4.26}$$

Let $S^{(j-1)}_{j-1} = F^{-1}_{j-1}(K^{(j-1)}_{j-1})$ and $S^{(j)}_{j,\beta} = F_j^{-1}(K^{(j)}_{j,\beta})$; we must have $S^{(j)}_{j,\alpha} \neq S^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1}$ and $\pi_{j-1}(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\beta)) \in S^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}$. Note that $F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\beta)$ must be at distance $\geq 5^{-3} \operatorname{diam}(\partial S^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}})$ from $\partial S^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}$ so that

$$\phi(r(\mathrm{pj}_{\xi_j,\zeta_j}(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\beta)))) \geq 5^{-3} \operatorname{diam}(\partial S^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}), \tag{4.27}$$

where $e_{\xi_j} \oplus e_{\zeta_j} = j - 1 \mod \binom{k}{2}$. As $F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\alpha) \neq F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_{\alpha+1})$, they belong to different sheets of the double cover, and as $\pi_{j-1}(S^{(j)}_{j,\alpha})$ and $\pi_{j-1}(S^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1})$ are adjacent, we let $\hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha$ be the center of the cell of $\mathrm{Cell}_{i_n-j}(X_j)$ adjacent to $K^{(j)}_{i_n,\alpha+1}$ and such that $\pi_{j-1}(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\alpha)) = \pi_{j-1}(F_j^{-1}(\hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha))$. We now have:

$$r(\mathrm{pj}_{\xi_j,\zeta_j}(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\alpha)) = r(\mathrm{pj}_{\xi_j,\zeta_j}(F_j^{-1}(\hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha)) \tag{4.28}$$

$$\left|\theta(\mathrm{pj}_{\xi_j,\zeta_j}(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\alpha)) - \theta(\mathrm{pj}_{\xi_j,\zeta_j}(F_j^{-1}(q^{(j)}_\alpha))\right| = \pi. \tag{4.29}$$

Invoking (2.7) we get:

$$d(q^{(j)}_\alpha, \hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha) \geq \frac{5^{-3}}{2}\delta_j \operatorname{diam}(\partial S^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}) \geq \frac{5^{-3}}{2\mathbf{L}(F_0)}\delta_n \operatorname{diam} Q, \tag{4.30}$$

where we used that F_∞ and the maps $P_{\infty,n}$ are Lipschitz and that Q lies in the F_0-image of $S^{(j-1)}_{j-1,\mathrm{a}}$. But as $\hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha$ is the center of the cell of $\mathrm{Cell}_{i_n-j}(X_j)$ adjacent to $K^{(j)}_{i_n,\alpha+1}$ we get:

$$d(q^{(j)}_\alpha, \hat{q}^{(j)}_\alpha) \leq 16(\sqrt{k}C + \mathbf{L}(F_\infty)) \times c\delta_n \operatorname{diam} Q. \tag{4.31}$$

Thus, if c is chosen sufficiently small in function of $\sqrt{k}, C, \mathbf{L}(F_\infty)$ we obtain a contradiction and conclude that $K^{(j)}_{j,\alpha} = K^{(j)}_{j,\alpha+1}$. A consequence of this discussion,

specialized to $j = n$, is that $\Phi_n(p_1)$ and $\Phi_n(p_t)$ belong to the same sheet of the double cover $P_{n-1}^{-1}(\hat{K}_{n-1,\mathrm{a}}^{(n-1)}) \cap Y_n \to \hat{K}_{n-1,\mathrm{a}}^{(n-1)}$ while the choice of c gives:

$$d(F_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(p_1)), F_n^{-1}(\Phi_n(p_t))) \leq 5^{-3} \operatorname{diam} Q. \tag{4.32}$$

Note, however, that as $n - 1 = e_{\xi_0} \oplus e_{\zeta_0} \mod \binom{k}{2}$, from the definition of Ψ in Construction 4.1 and (**ShSep**) in Construction 2.1 we get a contradiction. Thus K misses one of the squares of the annulus A. □

References

[ACP10] Giovanni Alberti, Marianna Csörnyei, and David Preiss. Differentiability of Lipschitz functions, structure of null sets, and other problems. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians. Volume III*, pages 1379–1394, New Delhi, 2010. Hindustan Book Agency.

[AFP00] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and Diego Pallara. *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.

[AK00a] Luigi Ambrosio and Bernd Kirchheim. Currents in metric spaces. *Acta Math.*, 185(1):1–80, 2000.

[AK00b] Luigi Ambrosio and Bernd Kirchheim. Rectifiable sets in metric and Banach spaces. *Math. Ann.*, 318(3):527–555, 2000.

[Alb91] Giovanni Alberti. A Lusin type theorem for gradients. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 100(1):110–118, 1991.

[DR16] G. De Philippis and F. Rindler. On the structure of $\mathcal{A}$-free measures and applications. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2016.

[Fed69] Herbert Federer. *Geometric measure theory*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 153. Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1969.

[GBV93] I. Guyon, B. Boser, and V. Vapnik. Automatic capacity tuning of very large vc-dimension classifiers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 147–155. Morgan Kaufmann, 1993.

[Kir94] Bernd Kirchheim. Rectifiable metric spaces: local structure and regularity of the Hausdorff measure. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 121(1):113–123, 1994.

[Mas14] Annalisa Massaccesi. *Currents with coefficients in groups, applications and other problems in Geometric Measure Theory*. PhD thesis, SNS, Pisa, 2014.

[Mát] András Máthé. Nonplanar measure in r^3 invariant under two independent flows. In preparation.

[mor86] Some open problems in geometric measure theory and its applications suggested by participants of the 1984 AMS summer institute. In J. E. Brothers, editor, *Geometric measure theory and the calculus of variations (Arcata, Calif., 1984)*, volume 44 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 441–464. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1986.

[MRT12] Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. *Foundations of machine learning*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2012.

[Sch14] A. Schioppa. Metric Currents and Alberti representations. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2014.

[Sch15] A. Schioppa. Examples of 2-unrectifiable normal currents. *ArXiv e-prints*, August 2015.

[Sch16a] Andrea Schioppa. Derivations and Alberti representations. *Adv. Math.*, 293:436–528, 2016.

[Sch16b] Andrea Schioppa. The Lip-lip equality is stable under blow-up. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 55(1):Art. 22, 30, 2016.

[Smi93] S. K. Smirnov. Decomposition of solenoidal vector charges into elementary solenoids, and the structure of normal one-dimensional flows. *Algebra i Analiz*, 5(4):206–238, 1993.

[Wil12] Marshall Williams. Metric currents, differentiable structures, and Carnot groups. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 11(2):259–302, 2012.

[Zwo88] Maciej Zworski. Decomposition of normal currents. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 102(4):831–839, 1988.

E-mail address: andrea.schioppa@math.ethz.ch